

(continued) Table 1A. Driver License Office Usage and Processing Factors.

	Initiated Transaction Volume	Usage		Processing	
		DLO	FTE	DLO	FTE
Humble	51,601	21.8	2.6	1.7	0.2
Huntsville	18,345	8.1	3.0	0.9	0.3
Hurst	99,217	40.8	3.1	4.0	0.3
Irving	51,545	21.9	2.3	2.0	0.2
Jacksonville	9,395	4.2	2.9	0.4	0.3
Jasper	9,694	4.3	1.9	0.3	0.1
Jourdanton	7,262	3.2	1.8	0.3	0.2
Kermit	1,010	1.4	1.4	0.2	0.2
Kerrville	14,070	6.6	2.3	0.7	0.2
Killeen	31,932	13.8	2.3	1.3	0.2
Kingsville	8,753	3.9	2.4	0.4	0.2
Kountze	409	2.1	2.1	0.2	0.2
Lake Worth	61,400	25.3	2.5	2.6	0.3
Lamesa	2,360	1.3	1.3	0.1	0.1
Lampasas	2,709	2.1	2.1	0.2	0.2
Laredo	48,095	21.3	2.2	2.0	0.2
Levelland	5,144	2.7	1.4	0.3	0.1
Lewisville	51,929	23.0	3.2	2.1	0.3
Liberty	12,070	5.3	3.0	0.6	0.3
Littlefield	2,867	1.5	1.5	0.1	0.1
Livingston	10,425	4.6	2.6	0.4	0.2
Llano	2,039	2.7	2.7	0.2	0.2
Longview	30,138	13.1	1.9	1.3	0.2
Lubbock	57,118	24.2	2.2	2.3	0.2
Lufkin	20,329	9.0	2.5	0.8	0.2
Marble Falls	9,090	4.3	2.4	0.4	0.2
Marshall	14,521	6.4	2.4	0.6	0.2
Mason	2,786	2.2	2.2	0.2	0.2
McAllen	54,362	23.0	2.5	1.9	0.2

(continued)

(continued) Table 1A. Driver License Office Usage and Processing Factors.

	Initiated Transaction Volume	Usage		Processing	
		DLO	FTE	DLO	FTE
McKinney	54,617	24.2	2.5	2.4	0.2
Meridian	2,022	2.8	2.8	0.3	0.3
Midland	30,236	13.1	1.3	1.2	0.1
Mineral Wells	7,317	3.2	1.8	0.3	0.2
Mission	6,153	2.7	1.5	0.3	0.2
Monahans	2,641	1.6	1.6	0.2	0.2
Mount Pleasant	10,552	4.7	2.6	0.4	0.3
Muleshoe	1,325	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.1
Nacogdoches	13,773	6.1	2.3	0.6	0.2
New Boston	3,945	2.2	2.2	0.2	0.2
New Braunfels	28,117	12.4	2.8	1.2	0.3
Odessa	29,145	12.6	1.8	1.1	0.2
Orange	18,353	8.1	3.0	0.7	0.3
Palestine	10,369	4.6	2.6	0.4	0.2
Pampa	6,714	3.0	1.9	0.3	0.2
Paris	11,661	5.2	2.9	0.5	0.3
Pasadena	44,686	19.8	2.2	2.0	0.2
Pecos	2,473	1.4	1.4	0.1	0.1
Perryton	2,903	1.3	0.9	0.2	0.1
Pierce	11,293	5.0	2.8	0.6	0.3
Plainview	8,195	3.6	1.4	0.4	0.1
Plano	96,739	39.0	2.8	4.5	0.3
Port Arthur	21,426	9.5	3.6	0.9	0.3
Port Lavaca	5,322	2.5	2.7	0.2	0.2
Presidio	1,265	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1
Quitman	7,984	3.5	2.0	0.4	0.2
Rio Grande City	11,049	4.9	2.8	0.5	0.3
Rockwall	30,744	13.6	5.1	1.0	0.4
Rosenberg	67,445	29.9	2.8	2.9	0.3

(continued)

(continued) **Table 1A.** Driver License Office Usage and Processing Factors.

	Initiated Transaction Volume	Usage		Processing	
		DLO	FTE	DLO	FTE
Rusk	649	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.1
San Antonio - Gen. McMullen	72,885	30.8	3.0	3.1	0.3
San Angelo	28,067	12.1	2.2	1.2	0.2
San Antonio - Babcock	101,874	43.1	2.5	4.7	0.3
San Antonio - District	65,478	27.7	2.7	2.5	0.2
San Antonio Pat Booker Rd.	85,098	36.0	2.2	4.1	0.3
San Marcos	28,368	12.6	2.8	1.3	0.3
Seguin	15,349	6.8	2.5	0.7	0.3
Seminole	2,589	1.2	1.3	0.1	0.1
Sherman	26,314	11.6	2.6	1.0	0.2
Sinton	6,928	3.2	3.5	0.3	0.3
Snyder	3,368	2.9	2.9	0.2	0.2
Stanton	327	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.2
Stephenville	8,471	3.7	2.1	0.3	0.2
Sulphur Springs	9,308	4.1	2.3	0.4	0.2
Sweetwater	3,665	1.9	1.9	0.2	0.2
Taylor	9,407	4.2	4.7	0.4	0.4
Temple	27,343	11.9	2.7	1.0	0.2
Terrell	20,983	9.3	2.6	0.9	0.2
Texarkana	15,618	6.9	2.6	0.6	0.2
Texas City	42,713	18.9	3.5	1.5	0.3
Tulia	877	1.2	1.2	0.1	0.1
Tyler	38,331	16.6	2.1	1.5	0.2
Uvalde	6,572	2.9	1.6	0.3	0.2
Van Horn	462	1.2	1.2	0.2	0.2
Vernon	3,716	1.7	1.0	0.2	0.1
Victoria	22,532	10.0	2.5	0.9	0.2
Waco	44,291	18.7	2.0	2.0	0.2
Wallisville	5,967	2.8	1.5	0.4	0.2

(continued)

(continued) Table 1A. Usage and Processing Factors by Office.

	Initiated Transaction Volume	Usage		Processing	
		DLO	FTE	DLO	FTE
Waxahachie	29,980	13.3	2.1	1.6	0.3
Weatherford	22,410	9.9	2.2	1.0	0.2
Weslaco	28,395	12.6	2.8	1.1	0.3
Wichita Falls	30,505	12.9	1.9	1.5	0.2
Woodville	2,484	3.0	3.0	0.3	0.3
Zapata	1,689	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.2

Table 2A. Driver License Offices within Three-Model or Two-Model Confluences.

Three-Model Confluences		Three-Model Confluences	
Driver License Office	Region	Driver License Office	Region
Alice	3	Brownwood	5
Alvin	2B	Bryan	2A
Amarillo	5	Carrollton	1A
Arlington	1B	Cedar Hill	1A
Athens	1B	Clear Lake	2B
Austin - North	6B	Cleburne	1B
Austin - North West	6B	Conroe	2B
Austin - South Congress	6B	Corpus Christi	3
Bastrop	6A	Corsicana	1B
Bay City	2A	Dallas - East	1A
Beaumont	2B	Del Rio	3
Beeville	3	Denton	1B
Boerne	6A	Dumas	5
Bonham	1B	El Paso - Hondo Pass	4
Bowie	5	El Paso - Northwest	4
Brenham	2A	El Paso - Scott Simpson	4
Brownsville	3	Floresville	6A

(continued)

(continued) **Table 2A.** Driver License Offices within Three-Model or Two-Model Confluences.

Three-Model Confluences		Three-Model Confluences	
Driver License Office	Region	Driver License Office	Region
Galveston	2B	McKinney	1B
Garland	1A	Mineral Wells	1B
Georgetown	6B	Mt. Pleasant	1A
Graham	5	NE Dallas	1A
Granbury	1B	New Braunfels	6A
Grand Prairie	1A	Odessa	4
Greenville	1A	Palestine	1B
Harlingen	3	Paris	1B
Hillsboro	6B	Pasadena	2B
Houston - Dacoma	2A	Plainview	5
Houston - Gessner	2A	Plano	1B
Houston - Grant Road	2A	Rockwall	1A
Houston - Townhurst	2A	Rosenberg	2A
Houston - Vantage Parkway	2A	San Angelo	4
Houston - Winkler	2B	San Antonio - District	6A
Huntsville	2B	San Antonio - Pat Booker Rd.	6A
Irving	1A	San Marcos	6A
Jasper	2B	Seminole	4
Kerrville	6A	Sherman	1B
Killeen	6B	Temple	6B
Laredo	3	Terrell	1A
Levelland	5	Texarkana	1A
Lewisville	1B	Tyler	1A
Livingston	2B	Uvalde	3
Longview	1A	Victoria	6A
Lubbock	5	Waxahachie	1B
Marshall	1A	Weslaco	3
McAllen	3	Wichita Falls	5

(continued)

(continued) **Table 2A.** Driver License Offices within Three-Model or Two-Model Confluences.

Two-Model Confluence		Two-Model Confluence	
Driver License Office	Region	Driver License Office	Region
Angleton	2B	Hurst	1B
Ballinger	5	Jacksonville	1A
Big Spring	4	Jourdanton	6A
Brady	4	Lake Worth	1B
Canton	1A	Liberty	2B
Cleveland	2B	Lufkin	2B
Daingerfield	1A	Mission	3
Decatur	1B	Monahans	4
Eastland	5	Nacogdoches	2B
Ft. Worth	1B	New Boston	1A
Gainesville	1B	Orange	2B
Gatesville	6B	Pampa	5
Henderson	1A	Port Lavaca	6A
Hondo	6A	Weatherford	1B

Table 3A. FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Abilene	5	8	7.0	1.0	12	8	1.0
Alice	3	2	2.3	-0.3	2	2	-0.3
Alpine	4	1	0.7	0.3	1	1	0.3
Alvin	2B	5	6.8	-1.8	7	5.5	-1.3

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Amarillo	5	11	11.8	-0.8	15	11	-0.8
Andrews	4	1	0.8	0.2	1	1	0.2
Angleton	2B	4	6.7	-2.7	5	5	-1.7
Anson	5	1	0.6	0.4	1	1	0.4
Aransas Pass	3	2	2.7	-0.7	2	2	-0.7
Arlington**	1B	16	17.3	-1.3	21	20.4	3.1
Athens	1B	3	3.0	0.0	3	3	0.0
Atlanta	1A	1	1.1	-0.1	1	1	-0.1
Austin (Potential Mega)	6B	0	15.1	-15.1	0	25	9.9
Austin - North West	6B	11	13.9	-2.9	14	12.6	-1.3
Austin - North**	6B	22	20.7	1.3	25	22.8	2.1
Austin - South Congress*	6B	16	22.4	-6.4	19	19	-1.3
Baird	5	0	0.7	-0.7	0	0	-0.7
Ballinger	5	0	0.7	-0.7	0	0	-0.7
Bastrop	6A	4	4.2	-0.2	4	4	-0.2
Bay City	2A	2	1.9	0.1	2	2	0.1
Baytown	2B	8	7.7	0.3	11	8	0.3
Beaumont	2B	7	7.9	-0.9	11	7	-0.9
Beeville	3	2	2.1	-0.1	2	2	-0.1
Big Lake	4	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Big Spring	4	2	1.8	0.2	2	2	0.2
Boerne	6A	3	4.0	-1.0	4	3	-1.0
Bonham	1B	1	1.6	-0.6	1	1	-0.6
Borger	5	2	1.1	0.9	2	2	0.9

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Bowie	5	2	1.3	0.7	2.5	2	0.7
Brady	4	1	0.7	0.3	1	1	0.3
Breckenridge	5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5
Brenham	2A	2	2.0	0.0	3	2	0.0
Brownfield	5	1	0.7	0.3	2	1	0.3
Brownsville	3	8	11.4	-3.4	11	10.1	-1.3
Brownwood	5	2	2.0	0.0	3	2	0.0
Bryan	2A	10	11.1	-1.1	13	10	-1.1
Burnet	6B	1	0.9	0.1	1	1	0.1
Cameron	6B	1	1.4	-0.4	1	1	-0.4
Canadian	5	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Canton	1A	2	2.7	-0.7	3	2	-0.7
Carrollton*	1A	12	18.0	-6.0	12	12	-1.3
Carthage	1A	1	1.2	-0.2	1	1	-0.2
Cedar Hill**	1A	9	10.1	-1.1	11	11	0.9
Center	2B	1	1.8	-0.8	2	1	-0.8
Centerville	2A	1	1.1	-0.1	1	1	-0.1
Childress	5	2	0.5	1.5	2	2	1.5
Clarendon	5	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Clarksville	1A	1	0.6	-0.4	1	1	-0.4
Clear Lake*	2B	10	15.9	-5.9	12	12	-2.9
Cleburne	1B	5	4.7	0.3	8	5	0.3
Cleveland	2B	3	3.2	-0.2	4	3	-0.2
Coleman	5	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Colorado City	5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Columbus	2A	2	1.6	0.4	2	2	0.4
Comanche	5	1	0.6	0.4	1	1	0.4
Conroe	2B	13	10.9	2.1	16	13	2.1
Copperas Cove**	6B	2	1.7	0.3	3	2	0.3
Corpus Christi	3	15	13.8	1.2	18	15	1.2
Corsicana	1B	2	2.5	-0.5	3	2	-0.5
Crane	4	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5
Crockett	2B	1	1.2	-0.2	1	1	-0.2
Crosbyton	5	1	0.7	0.3	1	1	0.3
Crystal City	3	1	1.2	-0.2	2	1	-0.2
Cuero	6A	1	1.0	0.0	2	1	0.0
Daingerfield	1A	1	1.1	-0.1	1	1	-0.1
Dalhart	5	0	0.7	-0.7	0.5	0	-0.7
Dallas - East*	1A	19	23.5	-4.5	19	19	-1.3
Dallas - Southwest*	1A	11	21.1	-10.1	12	12	-8.2
Decatur	1B	4	2.6	1.4	5	4	1.4
Del Rio	3	3	2.1	0.9	3	3	0.9
Denton	1B	8	14.2	-6.2	11	11	-3.2
Denver City	5	1	0.6	0.4	1	1	0.4
Dimmitt	5	1	0.3	0.7	1	1	0.7
Dumas	5	2	1.1	0.9	3	2	0.9
Eagle Pass	3	3	2.4	0.6	4	3	0.6
Eastland	5	2	0.9	1.1	2	2	1.1
Edinburg*	3	7	9.5	-2.5	7	7	-1.6
Edna	6A	0	0.7	-0.7	0	0	-0.7

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
El Paso - Gateway**	4	13	8.9	4.1	16	13	4.1
El Paso - Hondo Pass	4	10	8.9	1.1	13	10	1.1
El Paso - Northwest	4	8	5.6	2.4	11	8	2.4
El Paso - Scott Simpson*	4	13	17.7	-4.7	16	16	-1.3
Fairfield	6B	0	0.9	-0.9	0	0	-0.9
Falfurrias	3	0	0.7	-0.7	0	0	-0.7
Floresville	6A	2	2.5	-0.5	3	2	-0.5
Floydada	5	1	0.4	0.6	1	1	0.6
Fort Stockton	4	1	0.9	0.1	1	1	0.1
Fredericksburg	6A	1	1.0	0.0	1	1	0.0
Friona	5	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Ft. Worth*	1B	12	18.5	-6.5	15	15	-1.3
Gainesville	1B	2	2.0	0.0	3	2	0.0
Galveston	2B	3	3.2	-0.2	4	3	-0.2
Garland**	1A	21	17.6	3.4	21	21	3.4
Gatesville	6B	1	1.5	-0.5	2	1	-0.5
George West	3	0	0.5	-0.5	0	0	-0.5
Georgetown	6B	5	6.1	-1.1	7	5	-1.1
Gilmer	1A	2	2.0	0.0	2	2	0.0
Goldthwaite	6B	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Gonzales	6A	2	1.1	0.9	3	2	0.9
Graham	5	2	1.2	0.8	3	2	0.8
Granbury	1B	2	2.9	-0.9	3	2	-0.9
Grand Prairie	1A	7	8.1	-1.1	7	7	-1.1
Greenville	1A	4	3.8	0.2	5	4	0.2

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every existing DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Model Reallocated FTEs, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. New FTE Disparity was calculated after FTE Assignments.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Groesbeck	6B	1	1.4	-0.4	1	1	-0.4
Hallettsville	6A	0	1.1	-1.1	0	0	-1.1
Hamilton	6B	1	0.3	0.7	1	1	0.7
Harlingen	3	6	8.0	-2.0	6	6	-2.0
Haskell	5	1	0.2	0.8	1	1	0.8
Hempstead	2A	3	3.0	0.0	3	3	0.0
Henderson	1A	2	1.7	0.3	2	2	0.3
Hereford	5	2	1.0	1.0	3	2	1.0
Hillsboro	6B	2	1.5	0.5	2	2	0.5
Hondo	6A	2	2.1	-0.1	3	2	-0.1
Houston - Dacoma*	2A	17	26.6	-9.6	23	23	-1.3
Houston - Gessner	2A	44	41.2	2.8	54	44	2.8
Houston - Grant Road*	2A	15	25.6	-10.6	20	20	-1.4
Houston - Tidwell*	2B	8	13.3	-5.3	11	11	-1.3
Houston - Townhurst**	2A	17	17.3	-0.3	20	19.6	2.3
Houston - Vantage Pkwy**	2A	14	11.2	2.8	17	14	2.8
Houston - Winkler*	2B	15	22.1	-7.1	18	18	-2.6
Humble	2B	10	12.8	-2.8	14	11.4	-1.4
Huntsville	2B	3	4.7	-1.7	6	3.3	-1.4
Hurst*	1B	16	24.1	-8.1	22	22	-1.3
Irving	1A	11	15.9	-4.9	15	14.6	-1.3
Jacksonville	1A	2	1.9	0.1	2	2	0.1
Jasper	2B	3	2.0	1.0	3	3	1.0
Jourdanton	6A	2	2.2	-0.2	3	2	-0.2
Katy** (Potential Mega)	2A	0	18.7	-18.7	0	25	6.3

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every exiting DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Modeled FTE Reallocation, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. After FTE Assignments, New FTE Disparities were calculated.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Kermit	4	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Kerrville	6A	3	3.0	0.0	5	3	0.0
Killeen*	6B	7	10.5	-3.5	9	9	-1.4
Kingsville	3	2	1.9	0.1	3	2	0.1
Kountze	2B	0	2.0	-2.0	0	0	-2.0
Lake Worth	1B	12	15.8	-3.8	15	14.5	-1.3
Lamesa	4	1	0.8	0.2	1	1	0.2
Lampasas	6B	1	0.8	0.2	1	1	0.2
Laredo	3	11	11.7	-0.7	12	11	-0.7
Levelland	5	2	1.2	0.8	2	2	0.8
Lewisville	1B	8	14.8	-6.8	11	11	-3.8
Liberty	2B	2	2.2	-0.2	3	2	-0.2
Littlefield	5	1	0.6	0.4	1	1	0.4
Livingston	2B	2	2.6	-0.6	3	2	-0.6
Llano	6B	0	0.6	-0.6	0	0	-0.6
Longview	1A	8	7.1	0.9	9	8	0.9
Lubbock	5	13	14.8	-1.8	18	13.5	-1.3
Lufkin	2B	4	4.2	-0.2	6	4	-0.2
Marble Falls	6B	2	2.1	-0.1	2	2	-0.1
Marshall	1A	3	2.5	0.5	4	3	0.5
McAllen**	3	11	11.8	-0.8	14	14	2.2
McKinney	1B	11	11.8	-0.8	14	11	-0.8
Meridian	6B	0	0.8	-0.8	0	0	-0.8
Midland	4	12	7.7	4.3	15	12	4.3
Mineral Wells	1B	2	1.5	0.5	2	2	0.5

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every exiting DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Modeled FTE Reallocation, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. After FTE Assignments, New FTE Disparities were calculated.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Mission*	3	2	7.7	-5.7	3	3	-2.5
Monahans	4	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5
Mount Pleasant	1A	2	2.2	-0.2	3	2	-0.2
Muleshoe	5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5
Munday	5	0	0.2	-0.2	0	0	-0.2
North Arlington**	1B	0	9.1	-9.1	0	25	15.9
(Potential Mega)							
Nacogdoches	2B	3	3.4	-0.4	5	3	-0.4
Northeast Dallas**	1A	0	20.5	-20.5	0	31	10.5
(Potential Mega)							
New Boston	1A	1	1.5	-0.5	2	1	-0.5
New Braunfels	6A	5	6.4	-1.4	6	5.1	-1.3
Odessa	4	8	7.5	0.5	11	8	0.5
Orange	2B	3	3.1	-0.1	5	3	-0.1
Palestine	1B	2	2.4	-0.4	2	2	-0.4
Pampa	5	2	1.1	0.9	2	2	0.9
Panhandle	5	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Paris	1B	2	2.1	-0.1	2	2	-0.1
Pasadena**	2B	10	10.5	-0.5	13	13	2.5
Pecos	4	1	0.8	0.2	1	1	0.2
Perryton	5	2	0.8	1.2	2	2	1.2
Pierce	2A	2	1.6	0.4	3	2	0.4
Plainview	5	3	1.5	1.5	4	3	1.5
Plano*	1B	17	25.9	-8.9	22	22	-1.3
Port Arthur	2B	3	5.7	-2.7	5	4.4	-1.3

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every exiting DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Modeled FTE Reallocation, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. After FTE Assignments, New FTE Disparities were calculated.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Port Lavaca	6A	1	1.1	-0.1	1	1	-0.1
Presidio	4	1	0.3	0.7	1	1	0.7
Quanah	5	0	0.2	-0.2	0	0	-0.2
Quitman	1A	2	2.5	-0.5	2	2	-0.5
Rio Grande City	3	2	2.6	-0.6	3	2	-0.6
Roby	5	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Rockwall*	1A	3	9.0	-6.0	5	5	-3.0
Rosenberg	2A	12	8.6	3.4	16	12	3.4
Rusk	1A	0	1.0	-1.0	0	0	-1.0
San Angelo	4	7	6.0	1.0	9	7	1.0
San Antonio - Babcock	6A	20	23.3	-3.3	22	22	-1.3
San Antonio - District**	6A	12	11.7	0.3	14	14	2.3
San Antonio - Gen. McMullen*	6A	12	18.9	-6.9	14	14	-2.6
San Antonio (Potential Mega)	6B	0	16.4	-16.4	0	25	8.6
San Antonio - Pat Booker Rd.	6A	19	17.5	1.5	22	19	1.5
San Marcos	6A	5	9.6	-4.6	6	6	-3.6
Seguin	6A	3	2.7	0.3	4	3	0.3
Seminole	4	1	0.6	0.4	1	1	0.4
Seymour	5	0	0.2	-0.2	0	0	-0.2
Shamrock	5	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Sherman	1B	5	4.8	0.2	5	5	0.2
Sinton	3	1	2.1	-1.1	2	1	-1.1
Snyder	5	0	0.8	-0.8	0	0	-0.8
Sonora	4	0	0.7	-0.7	1	0	-0.7
Spring** (Potential Mega)	2B	0	17.0	-17.0	0	25	8.0

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

(continued)

(continued) **Table 3A.** FTE Assignments were recommended for every exiting DLO and potential Mega DLO. Existing FTE Allocation, Modeled FTE Reallocation, FTE Disparity, and FTE Carrying Capacity were used to recommend FTE Assignments. After FTE Assignments, New FTE Disparities were calculated.

Driver License Office	Region	Existing FTE Allocation	Modeled FTE Reallocation	FTE Disparity	FTE Carrying Capacity	FTEs Assigned	New FTE Disparity
Stanton	4	0	0.3	-0.3	0	0	-0.3
Stephenville	1B	2	1.8	0.2	2	2	0.2
Sulphur Springs	1A	2	2.0	0.0	3	2	0.0
Sweetwater	5	1	0.7	0.3	1	1	0.3
Taylor	6B	1	3.7	-2.7	2	2	-1.7
Temple	6B	5	6.5	-1.5	6	5.2	-1.3
Terrell	1A	4	6.1	-2.1	4	4	-2.1
Texarkana	1A	3	3.1	-0.1	4	3	-0.1
Texas City	2B	6	6.6	-0.6	10	6	-0.6
Tulia	5	0	0.4	-0.4	0	0	-0.4
Tyler	1A	9	10.1	-1.1	11	9	-1.1
Uvalde	3	2	1.4	0.6	2	2	0.6
Van Horn	4	0	0.2	-0.2	0.5	0	-0.2
Vernon	5	2	0.8	1.2	2	2	1.2
Victoria	6A	5	3.9	1.1	8	5	1.1
Waco	6B	11	10.8	0.2	14	11	0.2
Wallisville	2B	2	1.6	0.4	3	2	0.4
Waxahachie	1B	7	6.3	0.7	11	7	0.7
Weatherford	1B	5	4.4	0.6	6	5	0.6
Weslaco**	3	5	8.1	-3.1	9	9	0.9
Wichita Falls	5	8	7.4	0.6	11	8	0.6
Woodville	2B	0	0.8	-0.8	0	0	-0.8
Zapata	3	1	0.7	0.3	1	1	0.3

* DLO with FTE Need, but limited Carrying Capacity, resulted in FTE(s) being assigned to a nearby DLO(s).

** Additional FTE(s) assigned from nearby DLO(s) due to nearby DLO's limited Carrying Capacity.

Red Driver License Office continued to have FTE Need because it reached Carrying Capacity and no nearby DLO(s) could absorb FTE(s).

Table 4A. Tier 1 and Tier 2 Potential Driver License Office Closures with closure criteria and comments.

Driver License Office	Region	Potential Closure Criteria					Sum	Comments*
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Anson	5		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Abilene (22 mi) or Haskell (30 mi).
Baird	5			1			1	
Burnet	6B		1	1	1		3	Customers can travel to Marble Falls (14 mi) or Lampasas (21 mi).
Canadian	5	1					1	
Coleman	5		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Ballinger (35 mi) or Brownwood (28 mi).
Colorado City	5		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Sweetwater (27 mi).
Comanche	5		1	1			2	Customers can drive to Stephenville (34 mi), Hamilton (33 mi), or Brownwood (25 mi).
Crane	4						0	
Denver City	5		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Brownfield (41 mi) and Seminole (21 mi).
Dimmitt	5		1				1	
Edna	6A			1			1	
Fairfield	6B		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Palestine (35 mi), Corsicana (30 mi), or Groesbeck (35 mi).
Floydada	5						0	
Friona	5						0	
George West	3			1			1	
Goldthwaite	6B			1			1	
Hallettsville	6A			1			1	
Johnson City	6B						0	
Kermit	4		1				1	
Kountze	2B			1			1	
Marfa	4						0	
Munday	5						0	
Panhandle	5			1			1	
Quanah	5						0	
Roby	5						0	
Rusk	1A			1			1	
Stanton	4						0	
Tulia	5			1			1	

TIER 1 POTENTIAL DLO CLOSURE

*Only potential office closures fulfilling 2 or more criteria that are recommended closures have comments. Mileage is approximate.

(continued) **Table 4A.** Tier 1 and Tier 2 Potential Driver License Office Closures with closure criteria and comments.

	Driver License Office	Region	Potential Closure Criteria					Sum	Comments*
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
TIER 2 POTENTIAL DLO CLOSURE	Andrews	4		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Odessa (36 mi) or Seminole (28 mi).
	Cameron	6B	1	1	1			3	Customers can travel to Taylor (42 mi), Temple (33 mi), or Bryan (43 mi).
	Carthage	1A		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Marshall (29 mi), Henderson (27 mi), or Center (27 mi).
	Daingerfield	1A		1	1		1	3	Customers can travel to Mt. Pleasant (17 mi) or Atlanta (33 mi). Daingerfield is losing population.
	Dalhart	5	1		1			2	Had one of the lowest transaction volumes and customers can travel Dumas (39 mi).
	Littlefield	5		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Levelland (23 mi) or Lubbock (37 mi).
	New Boston	1A		1	1		1	3	Customers can travel to Texarkana (20 mi) or Clarksville (39 mi). 2010 data shows that many customers already drive to Texarkana.
	Woodville	2B		1	1			2	Customers can travel to Livingston (30 mi) or Jasper (20 mi).

**Only potential office closures fulfilling 2 or more criteria that are recommended closures have comments. Mileage is approximate.*

Table 5A. Monthly percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds for each DLO averaged for CY 2010.

Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage	Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage
Abilene	23%	Alvin	31%
Alice	23%	Amarillo	21%
Alpine	18%	Andrews	26%

(continued)

(continued) **Table 5A.** Monthly percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds for each DLO averaged for CY 2010.

Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage	Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage
Angleton	25%	Bryan	19%
Anson	21%	Burnet	24%
Aransas Pass	24%	Cameron	24%
Arlington	25%	Canton	23%
Athens	22%	Carrollton	23%
Arlanta	25%	Carthage	21%
Austin - Capitol	0%	Cedar Hill	23%
Austin - Denson	1%	Center	19%
Austin - North	14%	Centerville	24%
Austin - Northwest	24%	Childress	25%
Austin - South Congress	19%	Clarksville	25%
Ballinger	21%	Clear Lake	23%
Bastrop	25%	Cleburne	24%
Bay City	24%	Cleveland	26%
Baytown	22%	Coleman	24%
Beaumont	20%	Colorado City	22%
Beeville	22%	Columbus	29%
Big Lake	25%	Comanche	23%
Big Spring	23%	Conroe	30%
Boerne	31%	Copperas Cove	21%
Bonham	27%	Corpus Christi	20%
Borger	25%	Corsicana	21%
Bowie	23%	Crane	31%
Brady	23%	Crockett	22%
Breckenridge	23%	Crosbyton	27%
Brenham	24%	Crystal City	23%
Brownfield	17%	Cuero	24%
Brownsville	21%	Daingerfield	24%
Brownwood	22%	Dalhart	27%

(continued)

(continued) **Table 5A.** Monthly percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds for each DLO averaged for CY 2010.

Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage	Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage
Dallas - Downtown	5%	Gatesville	26%
Dallas - East	18%	Georgetown	29%
Dallas - Southwest	18%	Gilmer	23%
Decatur	25%	Gonzales	25%
Del Rio	19%	Graham	23%
Denton	23%	Granbury	21%
Denver City	22%	Grand Prairie	20%
Dimmitt	23%	Greenville	23%
Dumas	24%	Groesbeck	24%
Eagle Pass	16%	Hamilton	21%
Eastland	21%	Harlingen	22%
Edinburg	22%	Haskell	26%
El Paso - Gateway	17%	Hempstead	34%
El Paso - Hondo Pass	19%	Henderson	22%
El Paso - Northwest	21%	Hereford	25%
El Paso - Scott Simpson	24%	Hillsboro	22%
Fairfield	28%	Hondo	26%
Floresville	27%	Houston - Dacoma	13%
Floydada	23%	Houston - Gessner	17%
Fort Bliss	4%	Houston - Grant Road	29%
Fort Hood	6%	Houston - Tidwell	16%
Fort Stockton	21%	Houston - Townhurst	22%
Fort Worth	20%	Houston - Vantage Parkway	20%
Fredericksburg	23%	Houston - Winkler	16%
Friona	30%	Humble	24%
Gainesville	24%	Huntsville	22%
Galveston	24%	Hurst	25%
Garland	23%	Irving	14%

(continued)

(continued) **Table 5A.** Monthly percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds for each DLO averaged for CY 2010.

Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage	Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage
Jacksonville	24%	Monahans	25%
Jasper	18%	Mount Pleasant	21%
Jourdanton	23%	Muleshoe	20%
Kermit	28%	Nacogdoches	19%
Kerrville	20%	New Boston	24%
Killeen	20%	New Braunfels	25%
Kingsville	19%	Odessa	20%
Kountze	13%	Orange	23%
Lake Worth	23%	Palestine	20%
Lamesa	22%	Pampa	22%
Lampasas	29%	Paris	23%
Laredo	22%	Pasadena	21%
Levelland	24%	Pecos	23%
Lewisville	32%	Perryton	28%
Liberty	26%	Pierce	24%
Littlefield	26%	Plainview	21%
Livingston	18%	Plano	25%
Llano	21%	Port Arthur	21%
Longview	21%	Port Lavaca	22%
Lubbock	21%	Presidio	25%
Lufkin	22%	Quitman	21%
Marble Falls	24%	Rio Grande City	28%
Marshall	20%	Rockwall	32%
McAllen	24%	Rosenberg	31%
McKinney	32%	Rusk	24%
Meridian	24%	San Angelo	21%
Midland	24%	San Antonio - Babcock	19%
Mineral Wells	20%	San Antonio - District	16%
Mission	10%	San Antonio - Gen. McMullen	20%

(continued)

(continued) **Table 5A.** Monthly percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds for each DLO averaged for CY 2010.

Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage	Driver License Office	Average Monthly Percentage
San Antonio - Pat Booker Rd.	25%	Texas City	22%
San Marcos	22%	Tulia	21%
Seguin	21%	Tyler	22%
Seminole	26%	Uvalde	20%
Sherman	23%	VanHorn	27%
Sinton	27%	Vernon	22%
Snyder	20%	Victoria	21%
Stanton	25%	Waco	21%
Stephenville	22%	Wallisville	27%
Sulphur Springs	25%	Waxahachie	27%
Sweetwater	20%	Weatherford	27%
Taylor	27%	Weslaco	23%
Temple	23%	Wichita Falls	22%
Terrell	25%	Woodville	27%
Texarkana	21%	Zapata	21%

Table 6A. Average percentage of initiated transactions by 15- to 19-year-olds by month.

Month of CY 2010	Average Percentage	Month of CY 2010	Average Percentage
January	21%	July	25%
February	20%	August	23%
March	22%	September	19%
April	24%	October	19%
May	24%	November	19%
June	28%	December	19%

Table 7A. Volume of initiated transactions for Temporary Visitors by Country of Origin.

Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions	Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions
India	9,572	France	347
Mexico	5,603	Kenya	296
El Salvador	4,159	Malaysia	212
China	3,810	Spain	201
United States	3,085	Somalia	199
South Korea	1,812	Indonesia	192
Honduras	1,370	Peru	183
Vietnam	1,183	Australia	182
Myanmar	820	Bangladesh	176
Iraq	819	Cameroon	167
Nigeria	748	Russia	155
Philippines	733	Argentina	148
Nepal	725	Angola	141
Saudi Arabia	620	Italy	141
Cuba	619	Singapore	133
Pakistan	605	Guatemala	129
United Kingdom	594	Congo	128
Venezuela	593	Egypt	127
Bhutan	579	Norway	124
Canada	573	Jordan	107
Japan	546	Kazakhstan	107
Colombia	502	Congo, DRC	105
North Korea	446	Israel	105
Germany	445	South Africa	100
Brazil	426	Ghana	97
Thailand	415	Sri Lanka	89
Iran	412	Zimbabwe	86
Turkey	375	Kuwait	84
Ethiopia	359	Netherlands	82

(continued)

(continued) **Table 7A.** Volume of initiated transactions for Temporary Visitors by Country of Origin.

Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions	Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions
Jamaica	81	Bulgaria	35
Eritrea	79	Finland	35
Burkina Faso	73	Afghanistan	34
Nicaragua	72	Rwanda	34
Chile	68	Syria	34
Ecuador	66	Uganda	34
Trinidad & Tobago	65	Belgium	32
Lebanon	62	New Zealand	32
Micronesia	62	Senegal	32
Romania	60	Cambodia	30
United Republic of Tanzania	60	Dominican Republic	30
Haiti	59	Greece	29
Burundi	58	Guinea	28
Ireland	58	Marshall Islands	28
Bolivia	55	Serbia	27
Ukraine	53	Grenada	26
Liberia	52	Hungary	26
Denmark	50	St. Lucia	26
Morocco	50	Zambia	26
Sweden	48	Belize	25
Costa Rica	47	Portugal	23
Libya	47	Switzerland	21
Cote d'Ivoire	46	Algeria	20
Gabon	44	Austria	20
Panama	44	Azerbaijan	20
United Arab Emirates	44	Turkmenistan	20
Poland	41	Palau	19
Sudan	39	Equatorial Guinea	18
Mali	38	Moldova	17

(continued)

(continued) **Table 7A.** Volume of initiated transactions for Temporary Visitors by Country of Origin.

Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions	Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions
The Bahamas	16	Mauritania	7
Benin	16	Niger	7
Chad	16	Oman	7
Bosnia & Herzegovina	15	Antigua & Barbuda	6
Croatia	15	Armenia	6
Sierra Leone	15	Slovakia	6
Albania	14	Togo	6
Bahrain	14	Bermuda	5
Qatar	14	Macedonia	5
Czech Republic	13	Barbados	4
Laos	13	British Indian Ocean Territory	4
Mongolia	13	Estonia	4
Uzbekistan	13	Latvia	4
Dominica	12	Madagascar	4
Belarus	11	Namibia	4
Lithuania	11	Central African Republic	3
Malawi	11	American Samoa	2
Kyrgyzstan	10	Aruba	2
Botswana	9	Brunei	2
Guyana	9	Fiji	2
Paraguay	9	French Southern & Antarctic Lands	2
Tajikistan	9	Greenland	2
Tunisia	9	Mayotte	2
Uruguay	9	St. Kitts & Nevis	2
Yemen	9	Samoa	2
Cyprus	8	Slovenia	2
Georgia	8	Anguilla	1
Iceland	8		
Mauritius	8		

(continued)

(continued) **Table 7A.** Volume of initiated transactions for Temporary Visitors by Country of Origin.

Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions	Country of Origin	Volume of Initiated Transactions
Christmas Island	1	Netherlands Antilles	1
Djibouti	1	Niue	1
French Guiana	1	Norfolk Island	1
Guadeloupe	1	St. Helena	1
Guam	1	St. Vincent &	1
Kiribati	1	The Grenadines	1
Lesotho	1	Seychelles	1
Maldives	1	Suriname	1
Malta	1	Turks & Caicos Islands	1
Mozambique	1	Virgin Islands	1